DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 136 SP 002 381

National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development. First Annual Report.
National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 31 Jan 68
Note-12p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.70
Descriptors-*Education, *Federal Legislation, *Manpower Development, *Professional Training, *School Personnel, Vocational Development
Identifiers-Education Professions Development Act, EPDA, USOE, U.S. Office of Education

The Council has only begun its work and is therefore not in a position to develop detailed recommendations based on thorough review and evaluation of existing programs. Our first effort has been to canvass the several federal agencies to make a preliminary determination of the nature and scope of their involvement in the preparation of educational personnel. Our deliberations following this initial inquiry have centered on four issues related to the Education Professions Development Title of the Higher Education Act and the functions of the Council. Our conclusions on these matters represent a declaration of intent: (1) The Education Professions Development Act with wise administration, imaginative proposals, and adequate funds has the potential for producing a profound effect on American education. (2) In all activities carried out under the Act's authorization, the emphasis shall be on quality. (3) The Act should be funded for Fiscal 1969 at the levels authorized. (4) Our approach to our statutary obligation to "review, evaluate and recommend" will be to face the question of priorities head on and to offer our recommendations in a way that will encourage informed debate by all those who have a vital stake in decisions that will be made by public and private bodies. (For Second Annual Report see SP 002 460). (JS)

ED028136

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY, 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SP002381

NOV 25 1968

from Joseph Young

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT

Washington, D.C. 20202

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

January 31, 1968

Sirs:

I am pleased to present to you herewith the first annual report of the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, submitted in accordance with Section 502 of Public Law 90-35.

The Council is only recently organized; hence, our report is brief. It is our hope that on January 31, 1969, we can present you a set of findings and recommendations which will be of substantial help to you--and to all those concerned with assuring that the nation has the number and quality of educational personnel that are needed.

We invite your suggestions and individual expressions of concern.

Respectfully yours

Laurence D Haskew

Laurence D. Haskew
Chairman

The President
The White House
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey
President of the Senate
Washington, D. C.

Honorable John McCormack
Speaker of the House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

SP002381

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT

Sister Mary Corita, IHM
Professor of Art
Immaculate Heart College
Los Angeles, California

Don Davies (Vice Chairman)
Executive Secretary
National Commission on Teacher
Education and Professional
Standards
National Education Association
Washington, D. C.

Adron Doran
President
Morehead State University
Morehead, Kentucky

Annette Engel
Coordinator, Counseling Services
Roosevelt School District
Number 66
Phoenix, Arizona

Susan W. Gray
Director, Demonstration and
Research Center for Early
Education
George Peabody College
Nashville, Tennessee

Laurence D. Haskew (Chairman)
Professor of Educational
Administration
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

E. Leonard Jossem
Chairman, Department of Physics
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Marjorie S. Lerner
Principal
George T. Donoghue Elementary School
Chicago, Illinois

Kathryn W. Lumley
Director, Reading Clinic
Public Schools of the
District of Columbia
Washington, D. C.

Carl L. Marburger
Commissioner of Education
New Jersey State Department
of Education
Trenton, New Jersey

Edward V. Moreno
Foreign Language Consultant
Ventura County Schools
Ventura, California

Lloyd N. Morrisett
Vice President
The Carnegie Foundation for
Advancement of Teaching
New York, New York

Mary Rieke
Member, Board of Directors
Portland Public Schools
Portland, Oregon

Theodore R. Sizer
Dean, Graduate School of
Education
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Bernard Watson
Associate Superintendent
of Schools
Philadelphia School System
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Dr. Rupert N. Evans
Dean, College of Education
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

* * * *

Joseph Young
Executive Director

The National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development was established by Public Law 90-35, enacted in June, 1967. Members were appointed by the President in September. The first meeting of the Council was held a little over two months ago.

The Council is charged

> ...to review the operation of this Education Professions Development Title of the Higher Education Act and "all other Federal programs for the training and development of educational personnel"
>
> ...to evaluate their effectiveness "in meeting needs for additional educational personnel, and in achieving improved quality in training programs as evidenced in the competency of the persons receiving such training when entering positions in the field of education"
>
> ...to "advise the Secretary and the Commissioner with respect to policy matters arising in administration" of the Education Professions Development Title on which their advice may be requested, and
>
> ...to make "an annual report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in this title and other Federal laws relating to educational personnel training) to the President and the Congress not later than January 31 of each calendar year beginning after the enactment of this section."

The President and the Congress have given this body a broad mandate: to evaluate existing efforts and recommend appropriate policies; to be concerned with programs in all Federal agencies; to include all types of educational personnel in the full range of disciplines and subject matters; to deal with all levels of education, pre-school to graduate school.

The Congress has also made it clear that it wishes the Council to undertake its tasks independent of the operations and policies of any of the Federal agencies involved

in the training of educational personnel. This is evident in the House and Senate Committee Reports on this legislation, and in the fact that the Congress has provided specific authorization of funds to the Council to carry on its work.

The Congress called for a body that represented the widest range of educational endeavor. It is already evident--in the brief life of the Council--that the President in his appointments, has assured a wholesome diversity in outlook. Clearly, no single view will dominate the deliberations and recommendations of this group.

The Council begins its tasks, then, with a most useful set of attributes: independence, diversity, and a broad and flexible mandate. We intend to exercise this independence, to encourage this diversity, and to reflect in our studies and recommendations a breadth of view appropriate to the intention of this statute.

Our first effort has been to canvass the several federal agencies to make a preliminary determination of the nature and scope of their involvement in the preparation of educational personnel. The Commissioner of Education has given us a very extensive briefing on plans for the administration of the Education Professions Development Act. We have studied the recommendations of the Planning Coordination Committee set up last fall by the Office of Education to advise it with respect to implementation of the Act. We have counseled with the Commissioner, at his request, on several policy matters.

Throughout, we have been encouraged by the active interest in the Council's work and the very helpful cooperation shown by every Federal agency. We are grateful to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Office of Education for the assistance rendered to the Council in the first stages of its organization.

The Council has thus only begun its work and is therefore not in a position to develop detailed recommendations based on thorough review and evaluation of existing programs. Our activities to date have necessarily been limited to the most preliminary review and consultation. However, this exploration has provided us with a basis for setting the direction of our work in the months ahead.

Our deliberations which followed this initial inquiry have centered on four issues related to the Act and the functions of this Council. Our conclusions in these matters constitute the substance of this first report:

1. The national resolve to transform educational ideals into a reality for all young people has found expression in a variety of legislative forms over the last several years. Nothing in this great effort has more significance than the passage of the Education Professions Development Act.

There is a growing appreciation of how central education is to the realization of individual and national aspirations. The quality of that education, therefore, becomes increasingly critical. We are now in the beginning stages of a substantial undertaking to reform and improve American education. Ultimate success in this will turn not only on dollars, and facilities, and organizational arrangements--but especially on people. To focus on the people of education, then, is to focus on the heart matter of educational reform.

The Education Professions Development Act was passed in the last session of the Congress to consolidate existing programs; to provide for additional categories of personnel; and to provide a more comprehensive rationale for federal policy in the development of educational manpower. It is broad in its coverage, giving recognition to the fact that the quality of education for Americans is in the hands of teachers not only of certain subjects,

but of all subjects; and not only of teachers, but of counselors, administrators, scholars,--of all sorts of men and women, professionals or laymen, who will come in contact with children and young adults, or who plan and manage our educational enterprise. In short, the Act is recognition of the fact that we need leadership at every level and in every aspect of schooling and scholarship.

Another featurs of this legislation, less dramatic but no less important, is the provision for a flexible approach to the various problems of education professions development. As a result it will be possible to devise plans peculiarly appropriate to each category of personnel cited in the Act. There is no doubt that the wisdom of this course of action will be evident in the months ahead.

But quite apart from the merits of its specific provisions, this Act stands as a symbol of concern and a signal for action.

In seeing to the enactment of this legislation, the President and the Congress have provided a symbol of the national concern for the importance attached to the work of selecting and preparing educational personnel. As such, it will surely have the effect of instilling new confidence in the thousands of people who are involved in these tasks and who have not always felt that their labors were known, much less appreciated.

This legislation is a signal for action. The control and support of the very large enterprise responsible for attracting, preparing, and employing educational personnel in this country are vested in institutions and agencies other than the federal government. To make advances, this enterprise will need increased financial support from existing sources. But its greatest needs are venturesome ideas, striking programs, key personnel. It is here that the federal government can, with wise placement of modest investments, call into action the new

ideas and programs that are developing. With a new vision of what can be done, we have the prospect of renewal in the entire system.

In sum, the Education Professions Development Act, with wise administration, imaginative proposals, and adequate funds, has the potential for producing a profound effect on American education.

2. The language of this statute makes it quite clear that in all activities carried out under its authorization, the emphasis shall be on quality.

Serious shortages of personnel have plagued the educational enterprise, at all levels and in all areas, for over two decades. And the problem will continue. Manpower resources will be further strained as the nation attempts to extend educational opportunity on a variety of fronts.

To cite but one example: a very substantial commitment is being made to improve the lot of those youngsters who come to education needing it most. To realize this aim, it is clear that additional personnel will be needed in very substantial numbers. But it is equally clear that little will be gained if the talents and ideals of these added numbers do not match the high purpose of this endeavor.

It is true that for educational opportunity to be real, it must abound. But it is also true that for it to be meaningful, it must be of a quality that yields the desired results. This applies with special force to the contribution personnel make to education.

It is the counsel--indeed, the mandate--of the Education Professions Development Act that these concerns for quality and quantity go hand in hand.

3. The Education Professions Development Act should be funded for Fiscal 1969 at the levels authorized.

Four reasons prompt this conclusion. Immediate implementation of the purposes set forth for the Act is necessary to capitalize upon its timeliness and potential for impact. Second, our review of the plans for administration of the Act convinces us that effective expenditure of the authorized amounts can be made in the initial year. Third, obligations to continue valuable existing programs are of considerable magnitude; this makes it essential that additional appropriations be provided to implement the legislation's new and inventive provisions. Fourth, the determinations made by Congress and the President in designing Public Law 90-35 appear to us to display sound promise for getting on with business of exceeding importance to the American people.

4. The National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development has been asked to contribute to an understanding of what is perhaps the most sensitive and complex aspect of educational endeavor. We feel a special responsibility to give some indication of how we intend to go about our tasks.

First, the federal government is searching for its most constructive role as one of a number of partners engaged in preparing educational personnel. What these other partners can and will do best, what help they need, and what responses they are making are factors to be taken into account by this Council in reviewing federal programs, in evaluating their effectiveness, and in suggesting what the national government should do. Thus, a comprehension of the total problem of educational manpower and development is required.

How that problem is defined will, in turn, be governed by what the educational system itself must become. Any policy devised for educational personnel must be in the service of the goals of education and the aspirations

of a people for the condition of its society in the years ahead. Such goals are cast in language that is general, abstract, often vague. Recommendations for policy in education, on the other hand, must be in a form that is appropriate for debate, for decision, for action. Our task will be to establish connections between the two as we carry out our explicitly defined functions.

Second, we shall conduct inquiries of our own, provide for channels for direct communications from the field, and commission some collections of data under our own auspices. Offers of assistance have been received from a number of sources. For example, plans are being made to have the Commissioner's annual assessment of educational manpower needs include the types of information we consider important. Hence, we shall undertake independent inquiries only when it has been determined that data available from other agencies, public or private, are not suitable for our purpose.

Third, the Commissioner of Education has made quite clear his desire that the Council advise at every point in the formulation of policies and plans for the Education Professions Development Act. This we are prepared to do. However, it is agreed by both parties that detailed involvement with the current administration of one Act alone--important as that Act may be--would serve to lessen the Council's effectiveness in discharging the functions for which it has prime responsibility. Those functions certainly include careful review of the policies and procedures related to P.L. 90-35, but also include similar attention to many other pieces of legislation. We shall continue to advise the Commissioner and the Secretary in the course of their ministerial functions, as requested, but with full awareness that administration is assigned to them.

Fourth, though each member of this Council will, quite understandably, feel that special emphasis should be placed on one or another of the issues related to the Council's charge, there is one matter about which unanimity has already developed: in considering policies related to the selection and preparation of educational personnel, our prime concern must be quality. We must not only be "for it". We must define it in ways appropriate to the various goals of education and to the variety of kinds of educational activity; and we must suggest ways to extend it to all aspects of education endeavor. This task is at once the most difficult and the most important thing we do.

Finally, we shall pay particular attention to the approach we take to our statutary obligation to "review, evaluate and recommend". This Council can make a special contribution if it develops its findings in most comprehensible terms; if it sharpens the issues, entertains all reasonable alternatives, suggests the consequences of each course of action. In short, our recommendations must be offered in a way that will encourage informed debate by all those who have a vital stake in the decisions that will be made by the public and private bodies having this responsibility. We can ask confidence in our findings and recommendations only if we can assure detachment in our approach, thoroughness in our review, candor in our observations.

We must face the question of priorities head on. Problems in the area of education professions development seem limitless. In making initial decisions about where to concentrate our energies, a case could be made for dealing solely with matters of great current urgency, or solely with long-range issues. We must make a wise selection of issues in both areas, using as a measure

"what is going to make the most difference". In our recommendations, we must not proceed as though human resources, funds, and time were inexhaustible. Priorities must be established. We must couple our recommendations concerning what ought to be done with indications of those things which can be done; those which must be done first; and those which must receive special allocation of resources.

This first report, then, is a declaration of intent: to establish the Council as a most useful instrument for the President and the Congress--and the professional and the parent--in their efforts to fashion wise public policy in the field of education. Our sights are high. They must be. We are dealing with issues that affect the society in a most fundamental way.

Respectfully submitted,

National Advisory Council
on Education Professions
Development

Sister Mary Corita, IHM
Don Davies
Adron Doran
Annette Engel
Susan W. Gray
E. Leonard Jossem
Marjorie S. Lerner
Kathryn W. Lumley
Carl L. Marburger
Edward V. Moreno
Lloyd N. Morrisett
Mary Rieke
Theodore R. Sizer
Bernard Watson
Laurence D. Haskew, Chairman

January 31, 1968